Enigma of Psychosis

Presentation for Legacies of antihumanism

MAKS VALENČIČ
JUL 17, 2025

4 1 Share

This is Nick Land.

Land's weakest element is when he keeps certain things opaque to himself. Especially when it comes to his almost complete suppression of autobiographical details, even if those can be found all across the internet. But I'm not interested in t empirical details concerning his life. Rather, what interests me is how he makes ser of his experience, the peculiar nature of his "personality" that enables him to have t very intense communication with the outside. Since this is the key element and the crucial aspect that the questions about his life are trying to untangle – no one really cares about who he's married to, but where his ideas come from. And it's true that Land has a lot to say about that, but he nevertheless isn't capable of answering "wh this is happening to him?" and what are the structural reasons for that, for this seemingly unique predisposition.

Psychotic Savoir is a reader-supported publication. To receive new posts and support my work, consider becoming a free or paid subscriber.

It's my belief that he's leaving this thing intentionally opaque to himself and others because of his suppression of psychoanalysis and Lacan more specifically. Every otl segment of his philosophical system is purely mechanical, purely objective; each

segment has a structure to it that doesn't have much to do with Land as a person, a no explanation for why something is the case remains at this level. Except when it comes to his autobiographical details that are still explained as not being caused by the same objective principles, same structural determinations. In his latest podcast appearance on the Theory Underground YouTube channel, Land is unable to explai his fascination with the occult and the esoteric, nor can he say much about the orig of the numogram. It is therefore necessary to apply structural theory to Nick Land a an event in the Nietzschean sense, in order to better understand the method drivin the theory of accelerationism.

So where does the numogram come from? This could be the title of this talk to be honest. It comes from the outside, that's undisputed. But what exactly is this outsid and who are the people capable of reaching it or being on the receiving end of its messages? One additional problem for why this is still not fully understood is connected to the dominant reading of Anti-Oedipus where the main emphasis is or schizo and not on the psychotic register in general. Even after Anti-Oedipus we stil don't have a structural theory of the psychotic register, at least not in an immanent sense, i.e. from the accelerationist point of view. Even if it's this register, this is my contention, that has been instrumental for the accelerationist project (for properly addressing the question of the outside in a structural sense and at the level of transcendental philosophy). As a reminder, the psychotic register is split between th schizo and the paranoic, as two distinct instantiations of the psychotic structural modalities of subjectivity.

This may sound slightly hyperbolic (and potentially is), but there should be a systematization of accelerationist philosophy within the psychotic register regardless of our potential aversion to Lacan, simply because this is the register where the question of "why" behind accelerationism can be most directly posed. I this is not the case, then accelerationism is always explained by reference to empiri phenomena, even when an inversion occurs and the empirical becomes transcendental, as in the case of technocapital, etc. What is needed then is to groun

accelerationism in a formal theory of subjectivity and to explain the accelerationist method at that level.

*

To understand the relation between psychosis and accelerationism one first has to understand what constitutes the psychotic structure. **In Lacanian psychoanalysis, psychotic structure is a product of the foreclosure of the name-of-the-father and, therefore, a failure or disruption in the subject's entrance into the symbolic order** the domain of language, law, and shared meaning that structures human reality. If t other is not accepted, then reality is also not established in return, as it is only thro the successful castration of the subject by the signifier that the symbolic becomes objective and binding for the subject. The other splits the subject, allowing the sub to experience the other as something directly connected to itself (e.g., their relationship to national identity, etc.).

Colette Soler introduces the concept of the enigmatic signifier to elucidate the effects of a foreclosed signifier within the symbolic order, particularly in the cont of psychosis. This exclusion disrupts the symbolic structure, leading to the return o the foreclosed element in the Real, manifesting as hallucinations or delusions. Nevertheless, this statement should be understood as a value-neutral judgment, as t function of hallucinations and delusions is primarily therapeutic and healing. Hallucinations are simply the subject's attempt to regain control over their failed (o broken) relationship with the other; the other must first be made coherent in order the subject to establish a functional relationship with it. But this coherence is now possible only in the external and not internal world. **Now, the subject must structu the other from the position of the other being an outsider (an outside), something that is external to the subject, even if they have to establish a working relationshi with it in order to have a functioning reality.** That's why it's said that the madman lives in a world of mirrors, as for them what is internal is external and vice versa (Kusters). The same is true for paranoia: the Other haunts the subject from the outs

even though the Other can no longer simply be integrated, as is the case with the normal acceptance of the signifier by the child.

Nevertheless, hopefully now is clear why the enigma of the signifier is a thing. **Because of foreclosure, the subject has first to decode the other, what the other is what is it telling them, what does it want, what the meaning behind it is. But the other always comes from the outside when this is the case, the other can only be known as something outside, alien to the subject, since this is the only relationsh that a subject can have with it. The Other cannot be controlled; it can only be predicted.** This marks a crucial shift from an integrated to an unintegrated relationship with the other—from a dialectical and mediated relationship where th other is contained within its relationship it has with us, to an other that must first b predicted in order for a relationship to exist in the first place. **But as soon as we mo from integration to prediction we move from the realm of subjectivity to the mechanical realm of cause and effect, i.e. from the domain of human relationship the realm of cold hard facts as objective invariants of nature. For this reason, understanding the other becomes synonymous with complete depersonalization o social relations and any remains of subjectivity across all levels of reality.** The oth simply has to win, since this is the only way that one can have a coherent reality, i.e where the question of the other has been transformed into the other being fully external to the subject, but which nevertheless determines the subject fully – it desubjectivizes it from the outside. **For the psychotic, the truth of the relationship resides solely on the outside, as all of the knowledge comes from there (the outsid** Because of the foreclosure of the other, the consistency of reality can only be established outside of ourselves, on the mechanical basis of cause and effect. Accelerationist anti-praxis mantra of letting-go is a nice encapsulation of this attitu precisely because letting-go is an affirmation of desubjectivization.

It's for this reason that the psychotic can only experience reality objectively, even these objective facts are complete delusion that are coming from the outside (intensities that have no potential of systematization); but nevertheless, these

delusions are not subjective but objective, as everything that happens to the psycho happens in the external realm. As Michael Uebel writes: "In the field of psychosis t distinction between realism and nominalism colapse." (Uebel, 2010, p. 147) That is t paradox of psychosis, which has not yet been fully understood, precisely because of focus on psychotic patients who have been reduced to a catatonic body without org as a result of their failed experiments with the outside. But in figures like Land and Joscha Bach there's a correction of that, since for them the search for the consisten of the outside has enable them to come up with increasingly mechanistic explanatic of the outside that aren't trapped in the symbolic structures of human culture, thus gaining them an upper hand on their ability to systematize and predict reality. Needless to say, this reality operates outside of any dialectic mediation with the symbolic, thus having an upper hand on its potential to influence how reality is transformed. Because what are mechanistic interpretations? These are interpretatic that vacate subjectivity from their explanation, as the world becomes transformed i a realm of mechanical causes and effects. Today, with the popularity of posthumani we see an attack against mechanism, where subjectivity is forcefully introduced int realms historically devoid of it. Think of various attempts at anthropomorphisation nature that are inspired by various animistic ontologies. Again, subjectivity is a regressive notion, precisely because it moves us back from one reality into another, from a cold to a hot one. Subjectivity is simply a case where the other gets triggered and wants something in return, it wants to become a part of us, it strives for integration or, alternatively, it wants to change the type of relation it has with us – from being external to becoming internal (Kant, Capital and Incest).

The problem of integration is, then, the following: since the other is not integrated, radically depersonalized. As R. D. Laing writes: "Depersonalization is a technique t is universally used as a means of dealing with the other when he becomes too tiresc or disturbing." (Laing, 1969, p. 46) **So the other is not simply rejected, but also depersonalized and transposed to the realm of nature, the realm of causes. But th can also be a productive move, since the other now has to be understood in order be predicted.** A different type of relationship with the other necessitates a differen

more absolute knowledge of the other (knowledge that is not mediated and is closer the noumenal realm, Neokantian reading of the imaginary register in AO), where th other has to be fully understood in order not to cause trubble. **This need for understanding necessitates a way more complex knowledge of prediction, to drea in an increasingly consistent way, as Bach would say, since in this case, the other never be understood, only predicted, while prediction is an objective knowledge c has about the system it's trying to model.** The psychotic is therefore interested in t outside, the outside of the symbolic, which, paradoxically, makes the psychotic structure more objective. This is because it not only registers relations in an immar way, at the level of intensities prior to their structuration, but also seeks to find the most all encompassing definition of the other through which reality can not only be systematized, but also fully predicted. The psychotic, in a sense, wants to reach the end of time, to exit the circle of samsara. Or as Uebel puts it: "Citing Schreber's preoccupation with soul murder as an example of strategic self-murder in order to survive, Laing notes that all types of psychosis share a formal feature, namely, "the denial of being, as a means of preserving being." Or what has been called "victory through defeat".

Psychotic Savoir is a reader-supported publication. To receive new posts and support my work, consider becoming a free or paid subscriber.

4 Likes · 1 Restack

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...

© 2025 Maks Valenčič · Privacy · Terms · Collection notice
Substack is the home for great culture